

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FOUR

In re WILLIAM H., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.
THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. WILLIAM H., Defendant and Appellant.

A124778

(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J07-00606)

Appellant William H. (appellant) appeals from a final judgment disposing of all issues between the parties. Appellant's counsel has filed an opening brief in which no issues are raised and asks this court for an independent review of the record as required by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Counsel has declared that appellant has been notified that no issues were being raised by counsel on appeal, and that an independent review under *Wende* instead was being requested. Appellant was also advised of his right personally to file a supplemental brief raising any issues he chooses to bring to this court's attention. No supplemental brief has been filed by appellant personally.

A petition was filed seeking to have appellant adjudged a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602, subd. (a)), alleging two counts of first degree residential burglary (Pen. Code, § 459, 460, subd. (a)) and one count of receiving stolen property (Pen. Code, § 496, subd. (a)). Appellant was released to the custody of his parents.

On May 21, 2007, appellant admitted the truth of all three counts, and the court continued proceedings to consider a delayed entry of judgment (DEJ), pending appellant's performance on probation. A probation department report recommended that the court order DEJ for a period not less than 12 months. Among the recommended conditions was that appellant make monetary restitution to the victim. On July 3, 2007, a home supervision violation hearing was held, and 90 days were added to appellant's term of home supervision. A hearing was set to review his status and to consider restitution. Thereafter, there were numerous continuances of the restitution hearing granted while attempts were made to obtain sufficient information necessary to conduct the restitution hearing. Discovery relating to this issue was ordered to be provided to appellant's counsel.

Finally, a restitution hearing was held on April 7, 2009.¹ Upon stipulation, the court reviewed two transcripts of hearings held on October 18 and 22, 2007, in a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 proceeding relating to another participant in the burglary, Jonathan K., held in another juvenile department. In addition, upon stipulation, the court reviewed the documentation submitted in support of the restitution claim to the probation department. At the commencement of the hearing, the juvenile court stated its tentative decision on the issue, including its reasons for the proposed restitution finding. Counsel were then given the opportunity to argue the matter of restitution. After hearing from counsel, the court ordered restitution in the amount of \$14,609. A DEJ review was set for June 15, and the court ordered that appellant make some effort towards satisfying the restitution order by that date.

On June 16, the DEJ was terminated by the court as being successful.

We have reviewed the entire record, and have concluded there were no errors in the petition proceedings. The restitution order was fully supported factually. Appellant was represented by counsel throughout the proceedings, and we have concluded there are no meritorious issues to be argued or that require further briefing on appeal.

¹ All further dates are in the calendar year 2009, unless otherwise indicated.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

RUVOLO, P. J.

We concur:

SEPULVEDA, J.

RIVERA, J.